

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

U.S. Patent Application No.: 10/791,887

Attorney Docket No.: Q80115

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Official Action in the present application. The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed February 14, 2006, and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of all claims under consideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Vaios (U.S. Patent 6,271,752). Claims 1-4 and 6-10 are allowed.

With reference to claim 5, the claim recites, *inter alia*, “the sensor means being adapted to provide a signal containing data being indicative of the occurrence of the event to the wireless module in response to the occurrence of the event.” Vaios describes a motion sensor alarm that wakes up the local computer previously idle in sleep mode when the motion sensor detects an obstruction. *See* col. 8, lines 37-44, and Fig. 4. Vaios does not teach or suggest that the alarm from the sensor contains data about the obstruction. In the rejection, the Examiner states that Vaios discloses “a sensor (10) in the form of camera, heat, sound pressure and so on for monitoring an occurrence of an event.” Applicant submits that the camera is an element distinct from the sensor in Vaios. The sensor wakes up the camera to start recording when it detects an obstruction. Therefore, the disclosure for the camera cannot be considered as disclosure for the sensor.

Further with claim 5, the claim recites, “the wireless module being adapted to send a wireless application protocol request being indicative of the occurrence of the event to a wireless application protocol gateway.” The Examiner alleges that the local computer system 12 in Vaios corresponds to the wireless module. The local computer system in Vaios sends a notification to a remote individual when it receives data, where the notification could be a beeper message, a telephone call, or an email message. However, Vaios does not teach or suggest that the local computer system sends “a wireless application protocol request being indicative of the

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

U.S. Patent Application No.: 10/791,887

Attorney Docket No.: Q80115

occurrence of the event to a wireless application protocol gateway,” as recited in claim 5. Therefore, the anticipation rejection of claim 5 should be withdrawn for at least the above reasons.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kelly G. Hyndman 39,234/
Kelly G. Hyndman
Registration No. 39,234

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 7, 2006